



**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

Atty. Docket No: 077251/0102

*In re* patent application of

Gottschall

Serial No.: 09/856,981

Filed: October 12, 2001

Group Art Unit: 1713

Examiner: B. Lipman

For: METHOD OF PRODUCING DERIVATIZED POLYMERS

**RESPONSE TO A RESTRICTION REQUIREMENT AND  
REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112, FIRST AND SECOND PARAGRAPHS**

Commissioner for Patents  
Washington, D.C. 20231

Sir:

In reply to the Office Action mailed March 7, 2002, please enter the following remarks.

Applicants concurrently file herewith a Petition for Extension of Time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a), with provision for the required fee, to extend the period for response for three months up to, and including, September 7, 2002 (response filed on September 9, 2002, as September 7, 2002 falls on a Saturday). If additional fees are necessary to prevent abandonment of this application, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 19-0741.

**REMARKS**

Applicants provisionally elect Group I, Claims 1 - 6, 9 and 11 - 13 drawn to methods of treating polymers, the polymer derivatives produced therefrom and the process of bonding using said polymers, with traverse. Applicants traverse the restriction requirement on the ground that the Examiner has failed to adequately establish that search and examination of the entire application constitutes an undue burden.

Applicants reserve the right to file one or more divisional applications covering the subject matter of the non-elected claims.

#8  
9/18/02  
RECEIVED  
SEP 13 2002  
TC 1100 MAIL ROOM

In addition to issuing a Restriction Requirement in the present Application, the Examiner has also rejected the claims under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as allegedly being broader in scope than would be enabled by the specification. Further, the Examiner has rejected the claims under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite. The Examiner asserts that the alleged lack of definition of the terms "activating reagent" and "derivatizing reagent," render the claims indefinite.


With respect to the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, Applicants urge that the claims are adequately supported and enabled by the specification. With respect to the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, Applicants assert that paragraphs 19 - 48 of the specification set forth the various characteristic features of the activating and derivatizing reagents. In short, the terms "activating reagent" and "derivatizing reagent" are amply defined in the specification. Thus, these terms do not render the claims indefinite.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first and second paragraphs is requested.

Applicants respectfully request examination on the merits of this application. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Respectfully submitted,

September 9, 2002  
Date

  
Ricardo J. Moran  
Reg. No. 48,735

FOLEY & LARDNER  
Customer Number: 22428



22428

PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE  
Telephone: (202) 672-5569  
Facsimile: (202) 672-5399